

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,049 10/11/2000		Venkata R. Jagana	BEA9-2000-0005-US1	4959	
25253	7590	12/15/2004		EXAMINER	
IBM CORI	PORATIO	)N	VAUGHN JR, WILLIAM C		
IP LAW DE	PT, ED02	-905			
15450 SW KOLL PARKWAY				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
REAVERTON OF 07006 6063				444	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/686,049	JAGANA, VENKATA R.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
·	William C. Vaughn, Jr.	2143	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		with the correspondence address	
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replication of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may y within the statutory minimum of t will apply and will expire SIX (6) M s, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed  hirty (30) days will be considered timely.  ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	•		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 O</u>	ctober 2000		
	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		atters, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 11 October 2000 is/are:	: a)⊠ accepted or b)□	objected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents			
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the prior</li></ol>	rity documents have bee	n received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies no	ot received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> </ul>		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

PTOL/326 (Rev. 1-04)

Art Unit: 2143

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson, U.S. Patent No. 6,718,347 in view of Latif et al. (Latif), U.S. Patent No. 6,400,730.
- 3. Regarding claim 1, Wilson discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Wilson discloses a system for communication between a first host and second host comprising: means for communicating between a first host and a storage area network using a area network protocol [see Wilson, Figures 12, 13, 16, Col. 34, lines 49-67, Col. 35, lines 1-12]; means for communicating between a second host and the storage area network using the area network protocol [see Wilson, Col. 11, lines 15-47]; and means for communicating directly between the first and second hosts using the protocol using the area network protocol [see Wilson, Col. 11, lines 15-47, Col. 14, lines 12-39]. Eventhough, Wilson does disclose ESCON communication links [see Wilson, Col. 10, lines 26-67]. However, Wilson does not explicitly disclose storage area network protocol.
- 4. In the same field of endeavor, Latif discloses (e.g., methods and apparatus for receiving, translating and routing data packets between different protocols). Wilson

Art Unit: 2143

discloses storage area network protocol [see Latif, Col. 1, lines 35-44, Col. 2, lines 15-67, Col. 6, lines 6-67].

- 5. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Wilson's teachings of a method for use in a computer system including first and second computers and first and second storage systems with the teachings of Latif, for the purpose of providing a more efficient means for communication between different protocols [see Latif, Col. 1, lines 65-67 and Col. 2, lines 1-54]. Thus, Wilson provides motivation to combine by stating that there exists a need improve performance modifying existing ESCON protocol [see Wilson, Col. 14, lines 28-30]. By this rationale **claim 1** is rejected.
- 6. Regarding claim 2, Wilson-Latif further discloses wherein the storage area network protocol is a FICON protocol (Latif teaches utilizing FCP (Fiber Channel Protocol), [see Latif, Col. 2, lines 15-34]. The same motivation that was utilized in claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 2. By this rationale claim 2 is rejected.
- Regarding claims 3, Wilson-Latif further discloses wherein the means for communicating comprises: means at the first host for translating between the storage area network protocol and a host-to-host communications protocol selected from the group consisting of TCP/IP [see Latif, Col. 6, lines 23-37] and SNA (The Examiner takes Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03), that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made for the communication protocol selection to have included SNA since SNA can be and is used with TCP/IP as well as being utilized at the data link layer and thus since Wilson does provide for the teachings of the data link layer that defines the physical format in which data is to be

Art Unit: 2143

transferred to and/or from the network), [see Wilson, Col. 32, lines 49-54]. By this rationale **claim 3** is rejected.

- 8. Regarding **claims 4-6**, the limitations of these claims are substantially the same as that of claims 1-3 and thus are rejected for the same rationale in rejection of claims 1-3.
- 9. Claims 7-18, list all the same elements of claims 1-6, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection of claims 1-6 applies equally as well to claim 7-18. Furthermore with regards to the limitations of encapsulating TCP/IP packets from the first host in 8232 protocol frames (Latif teaches encapsulation that is over a high speed network), [see Latif, Col. 6, lines 23-37]; transmitting the 8232 protocol frames to the second host using the FICON protocol [see Latif, Col. 6, lines 23-37]; and decapsulating the TCP/IP packets from the 8232 protocol frames at the second host [see Latif, Col. 11, lines 57-63].
- 10. Regarding **claims 19-30**, list all the same elements of claims 1-6, but in article for communicating form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection of claims 1-6 applies equally as well to claim 19-30.

## Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Vaughn, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3922. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-6:00, 1st and 2nd Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William C. Vaughn, Jr. Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2143

WCV